



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/126,683	07/30/1998	BRUCE ANTHONY BEADLE	AT9-98-303	9195

7590

11/07/2002

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, LLP
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/126,683

Applicant(s)

BEADLE ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10 – 13 and 16 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallach et al (Extensible Security Architectures for Java pages 116 – 128) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,608 to Roskind.

As to claim 10, Wallach teaches a Privilege (page 120, line 9 - 24), Method (page 120, line 18 - 40), Data Processing System (NOTE: Data processing system will be inherent in the system of Wallach), a Current Thread (page 120, line 27 – 31), a Stack and Stack frame (page 120, line 32 - 54), a Thread Identifier (“....thread...” NOTE: It is inherent that the thread would have an identifier and since every thread is associated with a stack and stack frame, in order to access the stack the thread must provide some identifier that associates it with stack), locating a linked List and searching the linked list (Although, Wallach does not explicitly show a linked list, the algorithm searches a queue of frames that contains the enable privilege (page 120, line 1- 14), a stack frame pointer (Wallach is not explicit about a stack frame pointer, however, the Target is an address/pointer to an address that matches the calling method (page 120, line 1 – 54). Wallach does not teach a run-time environment.

Roskind teaches a Run-Time Environment (Col. 4, Ln. 13 – 35). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Roskind to the system of Wallach. One would have been motivated to make such a modification to provide dynamic empowered access to security resources/method (Col. 2, Ln. 40 – 45).

As to claim 11, Wallach is silent with respect to locating the linked list within a stack frame shadow apparatus. However, since stacks are inherently made up of frames that linked the extended stack of Wallach would be made up of plurality of linked list and the extended stack would also be contained in some type of apparatus.

As to claim 12, claim 10 meets claim 12 except for validation information. Wallach teaches Validation Information (page 120, line 5 – 8).

As to claim 13, see the rejection of claim 12.

As to claim 16, Wallach teaches retrieving privilege information and validation information (page 120, line 47 – 54).

As to claim 17, claim 10 meets claim 17 except for storing privilege information, querying the stack frame shadow apparatus and deleting privilege information. Wallach teaches storing privilege information (page 120, line 33 – 45), querying the stack frame shadow apparatus (page 120, line 47 – 54: NOTE: Although Wallach does not teach a stack shadow frame apparatus, is inherent that the extended stack would be some type of apparatus and deleting privilege information (page 120, line 15 – 24).

As to claim 18, see the rejection of claim 10.

As to claim 19, see the rejection of claim 10.

As to claim 20, see the rejection of claim 11.

As to claim 21, see the rejection of claim 12.

As to claim 22, see the rejection of claim 13.

As to claim 23, see the rejection of claim 14.

As to claim 24, see the rejection of claim 15.

As to claim 25, see the rejection of claim 16.

As to claim 26, see the rejection of claim 10.

3. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallach et al in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,987,608 to Roskind as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Introduction to the Capabilities Classes (Hereinafter referred to as ICC pages 1 – 15).

As to claim 14, Wallach as applied to claim 10 does not teach adding an entry if no matching entry is found.

ICC teaches adding an entry if no matching entry is found (page 3, line 11 – 21). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of ICC to the system of Wallach. One would have been motivated to make such modification to enable privilege for a method.

As to claim 15, Wallach as applied to claim 10 is silent with respect removing a matching entry.

ICC teaches removing a matching entry (page 3, line 37 – 47). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of ICC to the system of Wallach. One would have been motivated to make such modification to restrict enabled privilege (page 3, line 37 – 47).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M – F (First Friday Off) from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2126



ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100